THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K. Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 2.] THURSDAY AUGUST 22, 1918. [No. 18.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.
For *bona fide* students Rs. 3 only.
Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.

KAVERI—IV.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

On either side of thy bright silver stream
Fair emerald fields in sunlit splendour lie
Where Nature's gold of ripening corn the eye
Doth gladden. Palm and peepul, banyan, neem
And other green-robed trees in gladness dream
Beneath the shining sapphire of the sky
Begemmed with sun's orbed splendours burning high,
The moon's bright silver sphere, and stellar gleam,
These Nature's precious stones with radiance bright
That shine as daily joys upon our eyes
Unlike the gems concealed in mines or seas
Are God's sweet dower of blessing to our sight
A revelation bright of Paradise
Lit up by gems of Love and Joy and Peace.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 22, AUG., 1918.

The Reform Proposals in Detail—IV.

We now take up that portion of the Report which deals with the reform of the Provincial Legislature. The authors of the Report say:—"We have decided for the present against bicameral institutions for the provinces." They assign various reasons for this conclusion in paragraph 258. Those reasons are such as we cannot approve. But we entirely approve of their resolve to have a single legislative chamber only for the provinces, without an upper house. For over half a century we have had our legislation passed by a unicameral legislature, and no harm has arisen. Moreover, the Indians have never been an aristocratic people; and the distinction between conservatism and liberalism has been unknown in India. This applies to both Hindus and Mohammedans. For, both base the distinction between right and wrong on the injunctions of their sacred books, and these injunctions regulate the life of all classes of people. All of us are equally conservative or equally liberal. At the same time we quite agree that the head of the Government should have the power to decide whether any proposed legislation is desirable or not in the interest of the people or any section thereof. India is no longer a country where men are willing or able to base their activities on the injunctions of the sacred authorities to which they have long given their adhesion. The new education from the West has unsettled men's minds, and there are several who are sworn to destroy Hindu society and to introduce in its place the social institutions and ideals of the West. The Hindu people as a whole do not agree with these wild reformers, and there are also many among the newly educated men who wish to retain unchanged the traditional basis of Hindu society and its most characteristic institutions. They do not think India should copy the institutions of the West, as they are based upon the principle of exploitation, domestic and foreign. The ancient institutions of India are based upon the principle of Vairagya, and so are best fitted to preserve happiness and freedom to all people But the wild and impatient reformers are anxious to use the modern legislative machinery in India to achieve their object of transforming Hindu society through radical legislation the object of which is to destroy the Hindu conceptions and ideals of marriage. The Civil Marriage Bill and Post-puberty Marriage Bill were introduced respectively into the Imperial and Madras Legislative Councils by the representatives of the party of impetuous social reformers and were abandoned only after a great deal of agitation, and chiefly through the reluctance of Government to depart from their declared policy of religious neutrality. In India religion and society are inextricably intertwined, and Government have wisely resolved not to interfere with Hindu social ideals or institutions. It is the Governor alone on whom the people in the several provinces have to rely for the proper "discharge of his

responsibility for the peace or tranquillity of the province or of any part thereof,"—even supposing that there are no specially "reserved" subjects for which he alone is entirely responsible. The question of "maintaining order" is one which should always finally be at the disposal of the Governor as the head of the Executive, and we therefore quite agree that he must have effective powers of intervention,—especially "in matters which concern law and order, or which raise religious or racial issues, or to protect the interests of existing services." But we do not think that, for these purposes, the institution of Grand Committees is necessary. The Governor's powers of "certification" are enough, or even his power of veto will suffice. The authors of the Report say:—"Such a certificate as we have described would not be given without strong reason; and we suggest that the reasons justifying recourse to it might be included in the Instructions to Governors which the India office should issue." The Grand Committees are not wanted at all for the purposes stated. Moreover, the authors of the Reform Report say that the Grand Committee "should be chosen for each Bill, partly by election by ballot, and partly by nomination." The object of this provision is that "the composition of the Grand Committee ought to vary with the subject-matter of the particular Bill" in order "to ensure that whether by election or nomination all the interests affected by the Bill are properly represented." Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford are themselves aware that "the procedure suggested is cumbrous and dilatory and offers a premium to obstructive tactics." We consider that the Governor's power of veto will be enough to meet all cases, and what the authors of the Report call "the good sense of the Council itself" is enough to induce the members to acquiesce in the Governor's veto as the most ready and efficient means of dealing with emergencies as they arise. We are also certain that the power possessed by the Governor to dissolve the Council will enable him to control the Council and at the same time induce the Council to behave with discretion and moderation. Nor is the constitution proposed for the Grand Committee such as to induce us to hope that it will be a power for good. For the Governer is "to nominate a bare majority (of it) exclusive of himself." This majority and those elected members, however few, who differ from their elected companions will suffice to carry whatever measures Government sets its heart upon, and the entire machinery will become a solemn farce and get entirely discredited in the eyes of the people. For, it is provided that "the Council will have the right to discuss the Bill again generally but will not be able to reject it or amend it except on the motion of a member of the Executive Council." We are entirely against the establishment of the Grand Committees, and are of opinion that they will only prove another means of establishing the autocracy or despotism which the proposals for reconstituting the executive tend to establish, as we have already shown in our previous article.

We think that the framers of the Report have not done wisely in withholding communal representation. If in every part of the British Dominions of the Empire men can combine local

or national with Imperial patriotism, we do not see why Indians should not combine love of their own caste or community with provincial or Indian patriotism. All Indians are expected to be loyal and fervent Imperialists. Similarly, Indians may represent the community or caste to which they belong, and yet they may be also loyal citizens of the Indian nation. The Report says:—"Division by creeds and classes means the creation of political camps organised against each other, and teaches men to think as partisans and not citizens" Englishmen are both "partisans" as being Liberals or Conservatives, and British "citizens" as well. A staunch Catholic or Protestant is also a staunch British citizen. Similarly, a Mudaliar or an Aiyangar, a Chetty or a Sastri or Row, may represent his own caste and yet be an ardent citizen of India as a whole or of an Indian province in particular. Already we are informed by a Reuter telegram, dated London, August 2, that Dr. Nair has been addressing a meeting of Members of Parliament on "the danger that any system of individual voting for Legislative Councils must result in excessive over-representation of Brahmins," and that "he argued in favour of communal representation." We fear that, if individual representation is insisted on, the prejudice created against the scheme by unscrupulous agitators would be so great as to threaten to wreck all schemes of reform. The Congress itself has declared in favour of communal representation. Though, for ourselves, we do not think that individual representation would result in the excessive representation of Brahmins,—for they form only a small minority of voters,—still we do not want to risk the loss of Indian reform by creating against it the prejudice of the various castes which want communal representation.

A Reuter telegram, dated London, August 6, announces that "in the House of Commons, Mr. Montagu announced that Government had agreed immediately to appoint Electoral Committees." We suppose that these are the Committees referred to in para 225 of the Reform Report whose duty will be to ascertain what sort of franchise will be suited to local conditions, and how interests that may be unable to find adequate representation in such constituencies are to be represented." The Committees will have on them not only all-India members, but also "one civilian officer and one Indian, appointed by the Provincial Government." The Reform Report says:—"The Committees' investigations into the subjects of the franchise, the constituencies and the nominated element will enable it to advise as to the composition of the Councils, which, we propose, should then be determined by the Secretary of State in Council, on the recommendation of the Government of India, in the form of regulations to be laid before Parliament." We have been promised a "very wide franchise," but the processes by which we shall have to reach the scheme of representation ultimately to be adopted are so complicated and the authorities who are to be consulted are so numerous, that there is reason to fear that the result will be far from satisfactory. Still, we will hope for the best. The Report says:—"We think that this is certainly a better method than to formulate such matters in the statute

itself." We beg to differ. If the system of representation for the United Kingdom can be settled by statute, why not that for India and the Indian provinces? Parliament is apt to take a serious and liberal view of its responsibilities. But the procedure proposed in the Report will lead to a great deal of narrow huckstering and bargaining kind of agitation at the commencement every where, and to frequent tinkering with the system of representation which is now adopted in order to placate those who are discontented and are strong enough, through their numbers, wealth, or otherwise, to make themselves felt. We shall wait and see how we get on with the Committees when they take up their difficult task in India.

The Indian Budget Debate.

Mr. Montagu made a remarkable speech in presenting the Budget this year to the House of Commons,—a speech which would have been impossible a generation back, perhaps even in the days of Lord Morley or his successor,—a speech for which the way has been prepared by the course of events since the war commenced. Mr. Montagu referred to some of those events with a generosity and appreciation rare even in these days when the hearts of our rulers are more responsive than ever to the demands, aspirations, and performances of the Indian people. He laid emphasis on the fact that India had raised over fifty-million sterling out of the hundred million promised,—a contribution which, he acknowledged, was not possible to a poor country like India, without "severely restricting the expenditure on vital necessities such as education sanitation, and development of industries." India had also made other war efforts. At the outset of the war, Indian troops had taken a brilliant and honourable part in stopping the Germans in their invasion of France—an invasion which fairly threatened to overwhelm the French opposition and lead to the capture of Paris. In Mesopotamia, Palestine, East Africa, and Egypt, the Indian troops had scored brilliant successes, and we are of opinion, though Mr. Montagu did not express anything like it, that these events on the Eastern front may prove to possess a great significance in deciding the close of the war,—a significance not yet clearly seen and adequately estimated. Mr. Montagu also referred hopefully to the progress of recruiting in India and said that "the men necessary to complete the new establishment would be obtained." These and other war efforts such as "the great exports" of wheat, tea, jute, wool, hides and minerals, in which India had cheerfully and enthusiastically taken part, had opened the hearts of Englishmen to the place of India and its possibilities as a source of strength to the Empire in the present and future. Mr. Montagu, with a true statesman's insight, laid stress on the significance of these momentous events in the current history of India and the Empire, and thereby prepared the hearts of the House of Commons for his reflections and revelations regarding the future government of India. To the same effect he also utilised his narrative of the manner in which Indian railways and Indian workers were helping in the transportation of materials for,

and in the construction of, the railways in Mesopotamia and Palestine. The flotillas on the Tigris and Euphrates were Indian rivercraft; and the lighting plant in Basra and Baghdad, and the agricultural machinery which was helping to revive the ancient fertility of Mesopotamian soil, were also largely Indian. These were facts which enabled the members of the House of Commons and their constituents to realise how India could help in the exploitation and development of these British estates of the future.

The implication and lesson, of these preliminary portions of Mr. Montagu's speech was that the British people should, in order to reap all these advantages from their possession and control of India, raise the political status of the Indian people and satisfy their aspirations for self-determination and self-respect. Moreover Mr. Montagu showed that these aspirations of Indians for a higher political freedom and status in the Empire were "the logical and inevitable outcome of British rule in India." That the present situation in India had grown out of the results of the educational policy which had long been pursued in India and had to be sympathetically dealt with had been recognised both by the late and the present Viceroys of India; and Mr. Montagu himself had "inherited the situation" from his predecessor, Mr. Chamberlain. The announcement of the 20th August that "responsible government was the goal of British policy in India," and the recently published Report containing the Reform Proposals of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford were simply the last events in a chain of causes and effects for which the fates had worked, and therefore the British people and Parliament must resolutely face the situation and organise all the measures needed in a manly spirit and with a full consciousness of the needs of the time. Lord Chelmsford was perfectly sincere and steadfast in "pursuing what he thought was right" and both he and Mr. Montagu were "jointly responsible" for the reform proposals contained in the Report which they had submitted to the British Ministry and Parliament.

Before proceeding further, Mr. Montagu pointed out that it would be "grossest breach of faith in the world" to go back on the announcement of the 20th August last, and that moreover "they could not say that self-government was right in every other part of the British Empire and deny it to India." Hence, "the first thing to do was to give a vote on the broadest franchise possible and to give representatives elected by them real and responsible work to do." He also proposed that the salary of the Secretary of State should be included in the Commons Budget Estimates. In order to keep India out of party, a Select Committee of the Commons was to be appointed from men of all parties and India would gain by Parliament's taking a real and sustained interest in Indian affairs and discharging fully its Indian responsibilities. This Committee would determine how much "control from home" would be relaxed and replaced by "control of the people of the country themselves." The effects of these measures would be (1) that the Legislative Council would become "far more representative than at present" and "ensured representative criticism

in Delhi and Simla"; (2) that "it could be easily developed from time to time in ordinary legislative machinery as soon as the Commons were ready to give up its control over the Indian Legislature"; (3) that, "if the suggested devolution from the Raj to the Provincial Governments were carried out, the functions left to the Raj would be things such as customs, defence, and foreign policy which were not concerned with British India alone."

It is to this kind of division of Government into compartments and the transfer of them one after another that Indian public opinion objects. No system of responsible Government has ever been established in this fashion, and the attempt would prove a dismal failure. The government is an organism, and no organism ought to have its structure mangled and mutilated in this fashion. The proceeding relating to the government of these compartments would be of a humdrum character as not to evoke any interest either in the representatives or the people themselves. Misrepresentation and Mismanagement followed by inefficiency would lead to the result that the Indian people would be declared unfit for responsible government, and that we shall only have a state of things which would be a great deal worse than now.

Mr. Montagu proceeded to suggest that even the three subjects—viz., customs, defence and foreign policy,—would in time be shared with Indians when the second Chamber could be reconstituted so that "the Princes of India who were now isolated would join the upper House in deliberating common affairs." It seems to us that Mr. Montagu was rather giving wings to his fancy than speaking like a practical and responsible statesman when he gave expression to these views. The Indian princes are not at all to be regarded as analogous to the British nobles. We think that the relation of the Government of India to the Protected States must be left more or less as they are, and that the ruling princes must be given full freedom to develop their internal administration without interference from without.

The proposed "Periodical Review" of the political situation in India by a special commission which should derive its authority from Parliament itself or by "more than one commission" (as stated in the report of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford) would only embarrass the working of the transferred departments, for they will be constantly haunted by the uncertainty as to what the commissioners would do when they take up the work of "examining the growth of capacity and responsibility in the electorates" and proceed to determine "the measure in which they give evidence of an active and intelligent use of the franchise. These being the conditions under which the commissioners will carry on their work, so far as we can gather them from the Reform Report, we have no doubt that the whole idea of devolution of responsible government by compartments is radically mistaken and will prove a snare and a delusion of the most embarrassing kind in the working of the transferred departments by the people's representatives.

Mr. Montagu concluded by referring to the appointment of the Committees recommended in the report. We have

already pointed out that we must wait and see how these Committees do their work before we can form any opinion as to their usefulness.

In the Debate which followed, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald insisted that agriculturists and workmen should have their due share of representation. All will agree to this proposal, and we trust that the electoral Committees to be appointed will bear this in mind. Sir J. D. Rees' interference in the debate only showed how mischivous he could be on all occasions, and we have criticised his views in full separately. Mr. Austen Chamberlain said that "progress in India must be through mistakes" and that the introduction of the reforms would not make for "increase in efficiency." The rest of the speakers, too expressed general approval of the proposals.

Mr. Montagu congratulated himself on the "whole-hearted acceptance by all speakers of the principle of self-government and concluded by saying that the scheme could not be introduced in a hurry, but after full deliberation and discussion. The drafting of a Bill would be a difficult process but would be steadily proceeded with.

Notes and Comments.

Whenever Sir J. D. Rees speaks, he must say something mischievous. Of this we are quite as certain as that the leopard cannot change his spots. Speaking at the recent Budget debate in the House of Commons, he said that "the Brahmins were the natural leaders of the people of India." So says a Reuter's telegram giving an account of the debate. A more mendacious statement cannot be made. Whether we consider the present condition of this land and its people, or its state in the centuries and ages which passed before the establishment of British rule, it is absurd and untrue to say that the Brahmins led the people of India.

* * *

Let us take the present state of affairs, One-third of the population of India is composed of the Mohammedans. Then there are the Sikhs, the Arya Samajists, the Brahmo Samajists, the Christians who now number many millions, &c. All these are outside the Indian or Hindu system of caste. Even if we consider the Hindus themselves the Brahmins have no power or pre-eminence in a state like British India where all the powers and machinery of administration are in the control of the ruling race and where our rulers have justly proclaimed equality of rights and opportunities for all. Like all other castes, sects, and races, the Brahmins are subjects of the British sovereign who is also the Emperor of India and are ruled by those who represent him in the administration and who are drawn mostly from the people inhabiting the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

* * *

The existing system of education and culture is equally available to all races, classes, and castes of all the Indian people. All have profited by it, and all who have the inclination for it take interest in public affairs and in organising the expression of public opinion on public affairs. Our public leaders are drawn from all castes and sections of Indian society, and so no one caste can claim a monopoly of leadership. Our Congress Presidents are also drawn from all communities and castes. Madras, has supplied one Brahmin, one Hindu, and one Mohammedan to fill the Presidency of the Congress. There is no reason to suppose that the leadership of the Indian people belongs "naturally" to any caste. Sir J. D. Rees must have necessarily had a motive in making so absurd a statement. Its being made in the House of Commons so soon after Dr. Nair's speech to certain M. P's shows clearly that it was also made with the same object of bringing about the abandonment of individual representation and the adoption of communal representation. We make this only as a possible

suggestion. We will wait for a full report of Sir. J. D. Rees' speech.

* * *

If we take the ancient or mediaeval history of India, we have no reason to suppose that the Brahmins were the "natural leaders" of the people of India. Leadership at all times must depend upon the qualities and capabilities of men who take part in affairs, and not upon caste or birth. In the age of Mahabharata, we find Sri Krishna, Bhishma, Drona, etc. among the great leaders. Karna was known as a "Suta-putra," and not as a Kshatriya. In mediaeval times, too, we find men of all castes as ministers and generals, as we see, for instance, in the age of the Nayaks, Mahrattas, and so on. It is unnecessary to dwell at length on a matter so evident and easily proved.

* * *

Our Shastras assign to Brahmanas only the guardianship of "*Dharma-Kosa*,"—both by teaching and example, and this has given them a certain amount of honour and prestige in society. Even now, in every country, the profession of teaching, however ill-paid, is regarded with a certain amount of consideration. Over and above this, the Brahmins were allotted the function of assisting in the performance of Yajnas and other ceremonies. Thus, we see that the causes of the prestige enjoyed by the Brahmins were due to other causes than political "leadership." If, in later times, Brahmins often served as ministers and generals under Hindu Kings, members of other castes, too, have likewise held such positions. Hence, it cannot be said that Brahmins had a monopoly of such positions or offices, and so became the "natural leaders" of the people of India. Sir J. D. Rees, therefore, had not a shadow of justification for his statement to this effect, or for his other statement that, when the reform proposals are given effect to, a Brahmin "oligarchy" would acquire power in India.

* * *

His Excellency the Viceroy spoke at Indore on the 7th instant, on the question of education and the teaching profession in India. He said, in the first place, "we should concentrate our attention on the training of our teachers. The mere possession of a degree does not constitute a teacher." We will similarly say that mere training in the science of teaching does not constitute a teacher. His Excellency is certainly justified in saying that "the science of teaching requires to be imparted as does every other science." But that alone is not enough. Something more is wanted.

* * *

His Excellency himself gave the clue to it when he referred to the Indian Guru. He said :—"The teacher has held a great position in the history of India. The Guru in the past has always commanded high respect and has been heartened by the reverence of his disciples." Why is it that the teacher of to-day does not possess the same prestige? His Excellency says :—"Teaching on the large scale which is now requisite will never obtain the dignity of an honourable profession until it comes to be regarded as a career in itself adequately paid and with prizes before it." While we are heartily glad that His Excellency recognises the need of improving the pay and prospects of Indian teachers, we think that His Excellency has not hit upon the chief reason why the teacher in India to-day does not always "command high respect" and is "not heartened by the reverence of his disciples." The teacher in India of old put the hall-mark on his disciples' fitness for the work of life. It was enough recognition of a man's fitness for his work in life that he was placed in a position to declare that he was the disciple of such and such a Guru. But now the University comes in with its examination tests and its degrees, and these alone are accepted as furnishing the hall-mark of fitness in a person for his profession in life. Hence, the work of the teacher has lost its importance, and neither the public nor even his whilom disciples attach any importance to it.

* * *

If the teacher of today is to be restored to the position and prestige of the Guru of old, it is necessary to abolish the present Examination system and to accept once

more the hall-marks of fitness furnished by the Principal and Professors of the College from which the candidate for employment, private or official, is turned out. In every college, the professors not only teach and train their pupils and disciples, but hold periodical tests for finding how far they have profited by their work. The college staff alone can testify to the merits of their students in an adequate manner and their testimonials deserve far more weight than the diplomas of our Universities. In our opinion, the diplomas are entitled to no weight at all. It frequently happens that some of the best students of our colleges fail at our University examinations, and some of the worst of them come out very well. Nothing is more calculated to discredit the teacher in the eyes of his pupils or the public than this absurd discrepancy between the estimate he forms and that furnished by the test of the University examinations. We think that some bold educational reformer should rise and endeavour to abolish our present system of examinations and secure to the work of our college staff and their estimate of their disciples' merits the recognition they eminently deserve. This will at once secure to the teacher of today the prestige which the ancient Indian Guru commanded with the public and the reverence which his disciples almost invariably paid him.

* * *

His Excellency, in addressing His Highness the Maharajah Holkar, desired him to "win for himself the renown of an educational reformer," and thereby "furnish an example and stimulus to the rest of India to go and do likewise." Lord Chelmsford is, in our view, entitled to great credit for inculcating originality, freedom, and courage to our Indian Chiefs. A great deal of harm—harm which is irreparable—has been done already by the policy hitherto pursued of prevailing upon Indian Chiefs to copy the administrative and educational system prevailing in British India and of patting them on the back whenever they yield to the pressure put upon them. We trust that henceforth there will be a change and that Indian Chiefs and Princes will give up their servile imitation of Anglo-Indian methods and aims in Indian administration and education.

* * *

We beg here to mention a personal experience of what took place when once conversing with a former Dewan in an Indian Native State. We made to him a suggestion that up to a limit of 50 Rupees at least, the appointments in the public offices should be conferred on qualified men who had not an English education or University degree. Our view was, and is, that vernacular schools would spring up to produce educated men qualified to hold such offices and equipped with the modern knowledge needed for holding such offices. In this way a great educational and administrative experiment or reform might be inaugurated, and gradually developed till at last the way would be paved for a purely national system of education and administration. The able administrator to whom we made the above suggestion acknowledged that it was worth trying, but said that he would receive neither the support of his own Indian Sovereign and master nor that of the British Political Agent accredited to the State. So, he had not the courage to initiate a much-needed reform, and consequently it was dropped. His Excellency Lord Chelmsford now inculcates independence of thought and action in education on Indian Chiefs and Princes. Let us hope they will not be slow to profit by the advice coming from so exalted a quarter. Not only in education, but in administration in all its branches, our Indian Chiefs ought to be left free to pursue their own aims and ideals, so long as their political relations with their British suzerain are unimpeachably safe and loyal.

HINDU MESSAGE

VOL. I.

OCTOBER 1917—APRIL 1918.

Bound in Cloth Price **Rs. 3** only.

Postage Extra.

Olla Podrida.

There is a new form of sensitiveness come into existence in these days. Many of the modern reformers of all degrees of sincerity and sanity openly flout public opinion and hold up our ideals to scorn. They parade their transformations of family life before the world and publish their views as to the right ordering of family life and social life from the house-tops. They take their women into club-rooms, lecture halls, and theatres and men and women sit together indiscriminately. They have already decreed that the dress of their women and children shall undergo changes and that there shall be no lack of crop in respect of their children's heads though there may be lack of crop in their fields. They declare that the Hindu households of the older type are lacking in the joys and refinements and graces of life. Worse than all they abuse their social and official position to inflict interdining and intermarriage on others seeking to bask in the sunshine of their smiles. Yet if any man seeks to make them see themselves as others see them, he is told that he has no business to talk over the domestic affairs of others. But we know nothing and say nothing about what you do with the members of your family behind closed doors. Family life has a social and public side as well as an individual and private side. The latter includes the sacred privacies of life where prying eyes are an intolerable nuisance. But the former is certainly open to the searchlight of public criticism. We have been led into these reflections by a gentleman who is a patriot and a reformer resigning his subscribership to the *Hindu Message* because certain acts of his involving far-reaching public consequence, though having a domestic side also, having been referred to by way of bare narration and not even by way of deserved severe censure after the matter was duly and fully published and criticised in the daily papers of Madras.

* * *

It may be of interest to learn that amidst the many inventions of modern India is the invention of new names for people. The latest invention is the name of *Aryavir* for Sir. S. Subramania Iyer.

* * *

Talking of the many inventions of modern India, I am sorry that I have forgotten for a long time to refer to one great modern Indian invention for which we ought to take out a patent lest other nations appropriate it. It is the art of transplanting by some invisible machinery or agency vast tracts of hill-sides and superimposing them upon mud pathways that hurt not human or animal feet and calling them *roads*. Our town is not the only happy spot where this invention of the Indian mind has been utilised in the service of Indian life. A widespread illumination of inspiration all over our happy land has brought about this most happy and desirable consummation.

* * *

The tongue of rumour says that while we are thus busy with inventions and the attainment of industrial and commercial prosperity without wasting time on words, many persons belonging to the idlest nation in the world—the Japanese—have chosen these strenuous times of universal war to come to India and see the beauty of the Indian moonlight. Quite naturally. They are moonstruck people wandering about aimlessly in life with unseeing eyes and unworking hands. They are swarming in big towns in India gazing at the seas and skies and stars quite unlike us who are full of strenuous work to preserve the purity and power of the flame of the highest Indian art and religion and to attain the ideals of universal enlightenment and self-sufficing industrial productivity and commercial activity.

* * *

In *New India* dated 7-8-1918 "A woman" asks in a horror-struck tone how selfish man in the performance of his task of constitution making (on paper) in India

---

Our Present Situation, Social and Religious

BY

G. Ramachandra Aiyar B.A., B.L.

Price per copy As. 2 only.

can ignore one half of the Indian nation—*viz.* the womanhood of India. It is refreshing to know that at least the fair sex is one and entire and homogeneous in this unhappy land distracted by many stupid and fratricidal feuds and dissensions. Perhaps this is the reason why there is no word corresponding to "fratricidal" which will express the mutual destructiveness of sisters. But the half of the nation that "a woman" pleads for is said to be yearning for the gift of franchise so that it may be busy all day long hearing or delivering lectures, sending or kicking representatives, and voting and unvoting men and measures. Is this the sum of life?

SCRUTATOR.

The Bhagavad Gita.

With an English Exposition
By K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, B.A., B.L.
(The substance of the lectures now being delivered at the Students' Sanatana Dharma Sabha, Trichinopoly.)

ADHYAYA I.

(*continued*)

संकरो नरकायैव कुलघ्नानां कुलस्य च ।
पतन्ति पितरो ह्येषां लुप्तपिण्डोदकक्रियाः ॥ ४१ ॥
दोषैरेतैः कुलघ्नानां वर्णसंकरकारकैः ।
उत्साद्यन्ते जातिधर्माः कुलधर्माश्च शाश्वताः ॥ ४२ ॥
उत्सन्नकुलधर्माणां मनुष्याणां जनार्दन ।
नरके नियतं वासो भवतीत्यनुशुश्रुम ॥ ४३ ॥

Such confusion of births leads to hell the destroyers of the family and also the family. The ancestors of such persons fall owing to deprivation of the offerings of food and water. By such sins which result in the degradation and destruction of families and which bring about confusion of castes, the eternal family virtues and duties and caste virtues and duties become extinct. O Janardana, we have heard it said that men whose family virtues and duties have become extinct will undoubtedly dwell in hell.

NOTES:

1. The importance of offerings of food and water in the manner prescribed by the scriptures is a fact that will be patent to any one who understands the Hindu scheme of life. A beautiful Sanskrit verse says:—

जीवतोर्वाक्यकरणात्प्रत्यब्दं भूरिभोजनात् ।
गयायां पिण्डदानाच्च भवेत्पुत्रस्य पुत्रता ॥

The divine beings known as *Vasurudradityas* accept the food offered to the Brahmins who represent them and give nutriment in a suitable form to the ancestors in whatever embodiment they may be. It is said that there are 96 *shraddhas*.

2. It may not be out of place here to say what Max Muller says about the Hindu Shraddha ceremony. He says: "I deeply sympathise with your shraddha ceremony; nay, I wish we had something like it in our own religion. To keep alive the memory of our parents, to feel their presence during the great trials of our life, to be influenced by what we know they would have wished us to do, and to try to honour their name by showing ourselves not unworthy bearers of it, that is a Shraddha ceremony in which we can all partake, nay, ought to partake whatever our religion may be. There is a real, though unseen bond of union (*tantu*) that connects us through our parents and ancestors with the great Author of all things, and the same bond will connect ourselves through our children with the utmost distant generations. If we know that, and are constantly reminded of it by ceremonies like that of your Shraddha, we are not likely to forget that responsibility that rests on every one of us. In that sense your Shradh is a blessing, on your parents because on yourselves, and whatever the future of your religion may be in India, I hope this communion with the spirits of your ancestors or *Pitris*, will always form an essential part of it."

3. I need hardly say that modern reformers of all degrees of conformity to reason and to revelation (old and new? I am speaking thus because new Dharma Sastras and Gitas etc. etc. etc. are now being sprung upon us) who give up the

Shraddhas or lessen their importance in our scheme of social and spiritual life are not Hindus in fact.

4. The story of Asthika in the Mahabharata makes us realise clearly the position of progenitors who leave no proper descendants.

5. Hence the destruction of family and caste duties, virtues, and graces due to confusion of births is a serious menace to individual and social welfare and is the greatest of all foes to the spiritual foundation of a stable social life. It must be prevented at any cost.

अहो बत महत्पापं कर्तुं व्यवसिता वयम् ।
यद्राज्यसुखलोभेन हन्तुं स्वजनमुद्यताः ॥ ४४ ॥

Alas! Alas! we have resolved upon committing a great far-reaching sin by seeking to kill our kinsmen out of greed for the pleasures of sovereignty.

यदि मामप्रतीकारमशस्त्रं शस्त्रपाणयः ।
धार्तराष्ट्रा रणे हन्युस्तन्मे क्षेमतरं भवेत् ॥ ४५ ॥

If the armed sons of Dhritarashtra are to slay me unarmed and unresisting, that will be the higher blessing to me.

NOTES:

Arjuna's idea is that his individual suffering would be nothing in comparison with the great communal and racial evils consequent on the decimation of families and social unsettlements caused by such a war.

(To be continued.)

Dharma—XI.

(By K. G. NATESA SASTRI, Vaidya Visarad.)

(continued.)

That famous advocate of Brahma Samaj 'Sitanath Tattvabhushan" seems to hold the view that our commentators "had no clear idea of a *method* and that the Western philosophy is superior in method." But unfortunately for him the late Professor Max Muller held that Western philosophers miserably lack in method and that is why the writings of most of them including that of many eminent living philosophers even is so unintelligible and obscure that we have to leave them in despair; while the philosophers of the East were far superior to them in plainly choosing their ground before beginning the fight. In fact they plainly declare what are the right instruments of knowledge which they accept as genuine and what they reject, what they take for granted etc. (*Vide* "*the Six Systems of Indian Philosophy, Introduction*). Everybody is perfectly free to hold their own estimation of things and if the learned philosopher mentioned above thinks the other way neither the late Professor or any body else can have any legitimate objection to that. To us it seems that the ancient commentators have faithfully preserved and presented to us the ancient method which is highly scientific and soul-satisfying. And hence it is that we have ventured upon an examination of what was the conception of "*Dharma*" among them at least from the time when Bhagavan "Badarayana" and Jaimini flourished in this holy land. A cursory glance at the Sutras of "Jaimini" and "Badarayana" will reveal their perfect mastery of the Science of Interpretation which is at once *sound* and *methodical*. And their commentators Bhagavan "Sabara swami" and "Sankara" reveal their sound grasp of the *method* enunciated by their Gurus. What else is required to prove that we have got the methods preserved faithfully to us. Those who have followed us till now in our humble attempt to represent the ancient view on *Dharma* would have clearly seen that the view represented by the late Professor Max Muller is the correct one. It will become more and more clear when we deal with the question of the absolute authority of the *Vedas* and its superhuman authorship or *eternality* as it is called. We are only dealing with the preliminary questions essential for a correct understanding of the real issue which is nothing but the validity of *chodana* as the *only* and *absolute* authority of *Dharma*. We

---

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager, "*The Hindu Message*", Srirangam.

have to make this remark lest it should be mistaken that our Sastras are rather loose and unmethodical. We shall now pass on to our subject proper and further see the contention of the *mimamsakas*. We saw that the real *criterion* which makes a *Pramana invalid* is that we should have been presented with some "*dosha jnana*" or it must be proved that there are *faults* in the source. This is the orthodox view, while the Buddhists maintain that *Pramanya* or *validity* emanates from *merits* or *guna* in the source, while *gunabhava* or absence of guna establishes the *Invalidity* of a *Pramana*. To this the *mimamsaka* replies:—

"गुणाभावस्याप्रामाण्यहेतुत्वे गुणस्य प्रामाण्यहेतुत्वं वाच्यम्, तच्च न युज्यते, गुणाभावेऽपि शुक्तिरजतादिज्ञानेषु शुक्लत्वभास्वरत्वादिरूपाणां तथाभूतानामेव दर्शनात् धर्म्यंशे प्रामाण्याच्च" इति ।

The passage means:—"If you admit that the absence of merits contributes to the *Invalidity* of a *Pramana*, it follows that its *converse* that presence of merits constitutes a *Pramanya* is true, which unfortunately is not a fact. For when we mistake the mother-of-pearl for silver, what is it that makes us mistake the one for the other. First the sensory nerves strike upon an object lying on the ground in front of us and carry the impression to the seat of knowledge when we start and discern that we find before us an object which is white and emits lustre. At once another set of nerves begin to operate and makes us remember that these qualities belong to silver which we have known already and then we conclude that what we see lying on the ground in front of us is silver. Now the lustre and whiteness brought to our senses generate a *bodha* in our mind which we had not before we came in contact with the object. In short a knowledge which we had not, has been newly imparted to our mind. Here we now clearly see that since, in spite of the absence of merits, a knowledge has been imparted to us, we can safely conclude that the real *criterion* for a Pramana is not the presence of merits but *bodhakatva* or "ability to impart knowledge." Until a contradictory knowledge or "बाधकप्रतीतिः" arises in our mind which goes to prove that what we see in front of us is not silver, but only mother-of-pearl, this knowledge will hold good for the रजतप्रत्यय does not disappear till then, and this conclusively shows that *dosha* or faults that generate the "*Badhaka pratyaya*" or contradictory knowledge is the real *criterion* which proves an *Apramanya*. Moreover the knowledge imparted to our mind by eyes falling in contact with whiteness and lustre will at least make us understand that there is a real object lying in front of us. To that extent at least it must be admitted that the *bodha* or knowledge is valid, for, firstly it is only after discerning an object in general that we begin to give it some name or strictly speaking we superimpose or make an *adhyasa* अध्यास on it, in the present case, in the shape of silver, रजत. In other words a विशेषजिज्ञासा or "a desire to know the specific nature" arises only after our knowing that there is an object in front of us. Secondly even after the "*rajata jnana*" is destroyed and the "*sukti jnana*" or "the knowledge that it is the mother-of-pearl" is restored, the former knowledge is *pramana* or *valid* to the extent that it was able to impart to us a knowledge about an object in general without specific attributes for that is not contradicted even after we get the knowledge of the mother-of-pearl. We shall again meet the mimamsakas next time.

(*To be continued.*)

Gleanings.

That Perfect One.

[A MEDITATION BY MAHARSHI DEBENDRANATH TAGORE.]

"Know that Perfect one, who is worthy to be known, so that Death, may give you no pain."

Know the Deathless. Then Death will give you no pain. Take shelter in Him, worship Him, know Him who is worthy to be known.

Death's cruel image is ever before us. The world itself is Death's symbol: Everything dies that is born. The restless, fleeting imagery of life, the changing, transitory history of man remind us incessantly of Death. Death is all around us and about us. How can we escape from its fears?

We are freed from all fear by taking shelter in the Deathless. In this world there is fear, but there is no fear in the

dwelling-place of immortality. In this world the pangs of death may overtake us: Yet even now, by taking refuge in the Deathless, we may get courage and win hope.

How wonderful, that in the midst of Death we may know the Undying! How wonderful, that we who are so feeble can take shelter from our terrors with the King of Kings and Lord of Lords!

Amid all the varied happenings of the world, man alone can consciously fulfil the gracious purposes of God. Birds and beasts, fish and fowl, live and move and have their being all unconscious of the kindly care of the Creator. They do his will, but know it not.

But man has this supreme gift of knowledge. Of his own free will he becomes one with the gracious purposes of God. Living in the midst of death, he alone attains the Deathless. Dwelling in the region of fear, he alone takes shelter in the Fearless.

When thus we learn consciously to depend upon that Pefect One, we move in a new world; we can never lose the joy of our soul. We may have suffering to endure, we may have danger to encounter, we may have sickness to overcome, but the joy of the inner spirit will remain unquenched. Taking refuge in the dwelling place of the immortal, the terrors of Death cannot affright us.

Therefore, so long as we remain in this world, with all its fears, let us not turn away, but draw near to the Deathless. The scripture says,—"Let me not turn away from God: let God not turn away from me; let there be no disunion."

Apart from God, all life would be waste and void. From God flow all our joys. He never forgets us for a moment.

Utter ruin would be ours, if God were to forsake us. So the scripture says again,—"Who could move or live, if this Being, whose very name is Joy, filled not the infinite space?"

God is the Giver of all joy. From our birth He has nourished us with His love. He remembers us at all times, that we may not become forgetful of Him.

How can it be possible for man to forsake Him? Have we not cares, anxieties, suffering, depressions of mind? Can we, then, bear to live without Him? Have we not fears and terrors? Can we, then, neglect His haven of Peace? Have we not sins and stains? Do we not need the shelter of Him who can make pure the defiled?

None but God Himself can give peace to our restless hearts. None but God Himself can drive away our fears in this fear-haunted world. If we forsake Him, we lose our highest good. Our best deeds become selfish, our purest enjoyment becomes ungracious.

In our times of joy, let us remember the Giver of joy. In taking our food, let us call to mind the Giver of our daily bread. In our repentance for sin, let us come to the Fountain of purity. Let us surrender ourselves to Him, and attain the new life of the soul.

Some may ask for instruction as to the manner of His worship. The worship of Him, whose tender care we enjoy, needs no instruction. The love of God, the great Giver of Good, cannot be taught by rote.

God Himself is the Teacher of teachers, the Father of us all. Let us come simply to Him in childlike adoration. Worship will be natural to us, if we are true to our nature. Only let our inner life grow freely, and we shall learn, each in our own way, to worship Him.

Those desolate countries where God is not worshipped, those destitute homes where His name is never uttered, those vacant hearts wherein His seat is not spread, are the dwelling places of despondency. Therefore from to-day take shelter with Him and begin your inner worship. Bring your thoughts and actions your faith and conduct, into harmony.

As a child runs to its mother's arms without fear, so enter fearlessly into His presence. Oppressed with sin, take refuge in Him with tears of repentance. And He, who is tender to the desolate, will give you freedom. Worship Him, who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

If any have the knowledge, but lack the joy of worship, then let them persevere in earnest prayer for purity of heart. Surely they too will feel His goodness.

At last, by all, in the inmost heart, the scripture will be understood,—"God does not forsake me; let me not turn away from God."

(*Modern Review*)

The Week.

The general war situation was never better than it is today. The German offensive has been turned into defeat and a decisive Allied offensive has taken its place. Pessimism prevails in Germany and all confidence seems to have been lost in the once trusted leaders. The new Allied push has been very successful and the general gains are so extensive in strategic quality that a further German retreat is inevitable.

* * *

The Conference at Calcutta of Moderate leaders from different provinces, presided over by Sir Narayan Chandavarkar has resolved that Moderates should abstain from attending the special session of the Congress and hold an All-India Conference at a later date.

* * *

The Rt. Hon. Amir Ali in a letter to the London Times agrees with Sri Theodore Morrison that the success of the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme will be seriously prejudiced if any attempt is made to disturb the principle of Mussalman communal representation. Such an action would create Mohammedan distrust both in the pledges of Government and of Hindu leaders. He believes that the unity of sentiment and consciousness of identity of interest which in due course will remove the necessity for special representation is clearly developing. And if the details are rightly handled it should not take long before it reaches the bottom.

* * *

The Nation, one of the friends of India in England, remarks in a recent issue that the Indian demand for Home Rule is "only a way of summing up the will of a people to deal itself with a whole complex of problems which touch its interests and its self-respect" and explains the meaning of the demand for Indian self-government thus :—

This land which still dazzles the ambitious soldier, is so poor that the daily income of its inhabitants was reckoned, at the opening of this century, at something less than a penny a head. Sir Charles Elliott, a very high authority, said that "half the agricultural population never knows from year's end to year's end what it is to have their hunger satisfied." Even to-day only one-fifth of the children of school-age go to school though native Baroda has contrived to establish universal education. The social grievance of the colour line, the grudging admission of Indians to responsible posts, the closing to them, until Mr. Montagu's recent decision, of commissioned ranks in the Army, and the rankling insult of their treatment in our Colonies—all these things have made our problem something more than a question of political machinery. Home Rule means for Indians the power to remedy these grievances.

* * *

A Madras Government Press Communique sets out that clean one and two and a half rupee notes in exchange for soiled and torn notes will be issued free from Government Treasuries and Post Offices.

* * *

There was a time when the weapons of war, used in the olden days, were cast away as antiquated and out of date. It was believed that they were absolutely useless for warfare in these days. But who knew that a time would come when expert military opinion would think of re-introducing the ancient armour in the 20th century. The fact is that history repeats itself. A Washington telegram says that the War Department announces that expert armourers in the workshop of the Metropolitan Museum in New York are busy modelling armour for the use of the American soldiers in France including helmets, shields and breastplates, comprising all the best types used in ancient days.

* * *

With effect from the 1st Sep., the charges for inland ordinary telegrams will be increased from As. 8 for a telegram of 12 words or less, with half an anna for every additional word, to a uniform rate of one anna a word with a minimum of As. 12, and the charges for inland express telegrams will be raised from Re. 1 for 12 words or less with 2 As. for every additional word, to a uniform rate of 2 As. a word with a minimum of Rs. 1—8—0.

Our Social Problem and the Bhagavad Gita By K. S. Ramaswamy Sastri B.A., B.L.

Price per copy Annas 4 only,

For 50 copies Rs. 10 only.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.